UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

* Case No. 17-CV-04262 (IL) GUSTAVIA HOME, LLC.,

Brooklyn, New York September 6. 2018 Plaintiff,

September 6, 2018

V.

EAST 93 HOLDINGS, LLC, et al., *

Defendants.

* * * * * * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR PRETRIAL CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE RAYMOND E. REYES, JR. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: DANIELLE P. LIGHT, ESQ.

Hasbani & Light, PC

450 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1408

New York, NY 10123

SHANE D. WAX, ESQ. For the Defendants:

Berg & David, PLLC

266 Broadway, Suite 503

Brooklyn, NY 11211

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. 4 Research Drive, Suite 402 Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

his responses were I don't know. He's the managing --

MR. WAX: He's the manager.

2.1

MS. LIGHT: He's the manager for the LLC.

But after we did his deposition and saw that he literally knew close to nothing about the foreclosure action and the affirmative defenses, we served a demand to depose Joel Leibovitz, which is his brother, who is the only member of the LLC.

We haven't received a response to that notice of deposition. But I spoke with counsel outside and he said they weren't really going to push back, but that Joel Leibovitz is in Canada.

So we have to see at this point whether we would do it by video or maybe do written interrogatories or something.

Because, I mean, like I said, Sam Leibovitz, when we asked him about his affirmative defenses, knew nothing. So we just want to do that.

MR. WAX: I would like to add we do object, not strenuously. I understand they're technically entitled to seek his deposition under the rules. He doesn't have the information that they're seeking.

The information they're seeking, I submit, is in their possession, if anyone's possession. It's they had the opportunity to depose the manager. The member is not going to have any more specialized knowledge.

```
4
 1
                  I suggested to opposing counsel we submit a
 2
        deposition by written questions because he's in Canada or we
 3
        could submit an affidavit saying I don't have any further
        information outside of the deposition. Alternatively, if they
 4
 5
        want --
                  THE COURT: So no one from --
 6
 7
                  MR. WAX: -- to have a deposition in Canada.
 8
                  THE COURT: -- no one from the LLC knows what's
        going on? They don't know about their affirmative defenses?
 9
10
                  MR. WAX: Well, the questions that were asked at --
11
        they don't know is not about information the LLC would have.
12
                  It's about whether plaintiff mailed required notices
13
        that are required by statute and by the mortgage itself,
14
        whether they were mailed to the initial borrower. So we're
15
        not going to have information about whether notices were sent
16
        to the borrower. I guess. We're not the borrower.
17
                  MS. LIGHT: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Just to respond
18
        to that. But their defenses are that they were not received.
19
        So how do you know they weren't received?
20
                  MR. WAX: The defense is that they were not sent.
2.1
                  MS. LIGHT: Okay. Are you sure? Because when I
22
        interpreted that --
23
                  THE COURT: Well, hold on. Hold on.
24
                  MS. LIGHT: Yeah.
25
                  THE COURT: How would they know whether they were
```

```
5
 1
        sent or not if they're not the borrower and they're not the
 2
                And is this just a defense made up by a lawyer who's
 3
        defending the case or is this real?
                  MR. WAX: These are defenses that are very commonly
 4
        asserted in foreclosure actions under state law that are
 5
        generally interposed by the attorneys themselves.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Yeah. And Rule 11 says you have to have
 8
        a good-faith basis to do that, right?
                  MR. WAX: I understand.
 9
10
                  THE COURT: Not just everyone does it. If that
11
        defense worked, no one would be in jail because everyone
12
        commits crimes, everyone smokes weed.
13
                  MR. WAX: All right.
14
                  THE COURT: Are you really going with that?
15
                  MR. WAX: Your Honor, it's --
16
                  THE COURT: Don't --
17
                  MR. WAX: I don't want to not answer your question.
18
                  THE COURT: Did you do the answer? Is it your
19
        answer or someone else in your office?
20
                  MR. WAX: I wrote the answer. I wrote the answer.
2.1
                  THE COURT: All right. Then if your client doesn't
22
        know, has no knowledge of whether these notices were sent, you
23
        don't have personal knowledge of that. Otherwise you can't
24
        defend your client --
25
                  MR. WAX: Right.
```

```
6
 1
                  THE COURT: -- because then you become a witness.
 2
        And if all you're doing is asserting a defense that is
 3
        commonly asserted in these types of cases, that's problematic.
                  MR. WAX: I would assert that it was my mistake. It
 4
        should have stated -- the answer should have stated upon
 5
        information and belief. But I --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: You still need a good faith basis to do
 8
        that.
 9
                  MR. WAX: But, Your Honor, I understand.
10
        appreciate your concerns here.
11
                  And I would also submit that -- not to push, you
12
        know, switch the topic here, but I think plaintiff's complaint
13
        falls into the same problems in Rule 11.
14
                  THE COURT: So then maybe you both should send Rule
15
        11 letters to each other and let the chips fall where they
16
        may, let the Court decide. It could be that the complaint
17
        lacks a good faith basis. And the answer too. So both sides
18
        get sanctioned.
19
                  I mean, I got to tell you -- I got to tell you --
20
        this is -- a loan was made, right? Wasn't repaid. Your
2.1
        client wasn't the original borrower, correct?
22
                  MR. WAX: My client was not the original borrower.
23
        I don't know that a loan was made. This was a credit line
24
        agreement.
25
                  THE COURT: Okay. This is about two people fighting
```

```
1
        about money. All right. You're all on notice. Your clients
 2
        and you guys are on notice.
 3
                  If you're not a hundred percent right, you're going
        to get -- you're going to get burned. So you either fix it
 4
        like by the end of next week or you risk it.
 5
                  You want this gentleman's deposition?
 6
 7
                  MS. LIGHT: Your Honor, yes, we would like to go
 8
        forward with that.
                  THE COURT: All right. I'll give you by -- until
 9
10
        the end of next week to figure out whether you're going to do
11
        it by written questions, video conference, telephone,
12
        whatever. All right. So you figure that out.
13
                  If there's no agreement, then I want a letter by
14
        next Friday. A motion to compel you could call it, whatever
15
        you want. A response the following week.
16
                  And so that's by the 14th, I'll get the letter. By
        the 21st, I'll get the response. I'll decide it for you.
17
18
                  And you're going to have -- one way or the other,
19
        whether it's -- in whatever form the deposition's going to
        take, that's going to be completed by October 5th.
20
21
                  So you need to -- if what you want is written
22
        questions, then you need to prepare them and submit them with
23
        your motion to compel saying we want him to answer these
24
        questions.
25
                  So that way we could -- everything's teed up for
```

```
1
       October 5th. Be done with it.
 2
                 Or if you want, if you want a live deposition,
 3
        whether it's by telephone, videotape, or in person, you don't
       have to submit those questions. But that deposition's going
 4
       to take place by October 5th.
 5
 6
                 MS. LIGHT: Okay.
 7
                  THE COURT: And I got to say, this really -- that
 8
        it's really annoying on both ends. Either a line of credit or
        a loan was made. Either it was or it wasn't. You don't have
 9
10
       proof of that yet?
11
                  MS. LIGHT: We do, Your Honor. We've provided
12
        everything to them. They still are questioning it. We have a
13
       HUD. I've spoken with the borrower's attorney. She's
14
        represented by Diane Bernstein on several occasions.
15
                  In fact, they were really close to reaffirming the
16
        debt. She acknowledges everything.
17
                  So I don't really know what he's talking about. I
18
       mean, you know -- so I understand it's their position. But in
19
       terms, we believe we absolutely have a good faith action.
20
                  THE COURT: Did you provide that information to
2.1
       them?
22
                  MR. WAX: This is the first time I'm hearing of
23
       this.
24
                  MS. LIGHT: Yes. Abraham David did the deposition
25
        in my office. And we had -- in fact --
```

```
9
 1
                  THE COURT: A deposition of the --
 2
                  MS. LIGHT: Of Sam Leibovitz, the managing member.
                  They've also deposed my client. Who, at the
 3
        deposition, they made him read through the note. They flew
 4
        down to Florida to do the deposition. They read through the
 5
        note.
 6
 7
                  And then there's -- in the note itself, there's a
        reference to -- I don't remember what the document is called
 8
        -- some like collateral -- like some collateral or rider.
 9
10
                  THE COURT: You told me about the borrower's
11
        attorney?
12
                  MS. LIGHT: Yes.
13
                  THE COURT: And then you morphed into Sam Leibovitz.
14
        He's not the borrower's attorney.
15
                  MR. WAX: I have no knowledge of any --
16
                  MS. LIGHT: No. No.
17
                  MR. WAX: -- communications or discovery involving
18
        the borrower.
19
                  THE COURT: Who is the borrower attorney? Diane
20
        who?
2.1
                  MS. LIGHT: Diane Bernstein.
22
                  THE COURT: All right. And what did she tell you?
23
                  MS. LIGHT: We've spoken multiple times about the
24
        debt. And she said on behalf of her client that her client
25
        knows about the loan.
```

2.1

She doesn't dispute ever obtaining the loan. We had discussed them reaffirming the debt and potentially -- we were trying to get the loan paid off one way or another.

THE COURT: So the loan was for a piece of property?

MS. LIGHT: Yes. In Brooklyn on East 93rd Street.

And Ms. Sing owns that property.

And then eventually, what I believe happened is is that once she fell into default, she sold the property to East 93 Holdings.

So East 93 Holdings is now the title owner, but they're not on the loan documents because Ms. Sing is. She was the owner of the property for several years I believe until she actually sold it to East 93.

THE COURT: So the original loan, was it backed up with a mortgage?

MS. LIGHT: Yes, Your Honor. That's why this is a in foreclosure.

THE COURT: And it's recorded?

MS. LIGHT: Yes, Your Honor. And they bought it subject to. They bought it for -- I believe he said at the deposition -- \$30,000. And the property's worth -- what we believe is -- about \$450,000.

There are tenants at the property. Allegedly they were paying rent, but they haven't paid rent for the last six months. I believe there are three tenants.

I sent them letters letting them know, making sure they're aware of this foreclosure action.

And, you know -- so they basically -- I mean, it's -- you know, going outside of the scope of this case, it's not even a good-faith purchase. They bought a \$450,000 from this poor lady. Ms. Sing is like an 80 something year old.

MR. WAX: Your Honor, if I may interrupt?

THE COURT: No.

MR. WAX: This is getting beyond --

THE COURT: No.

MS. LIGHT: She's like an 80-something-year-old lady. She accepted \$30,000 to purchase this property. All we're trying to do is just get back the money that she received.

And we believe we have established that. And we believe we absolutely have a good faith basis for this action.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WAX: Your Honor, first of all, I believe there might be a discovery violation going on here to the extent we have never been informed about any of these conversations, or any documents, or anything going on between plaintiff and the borrower, or Diane Bernstein.

THE COURT: Did you ask for that?

MR. WAX: We asked for all persons with knowledge. We had sent discovery demands a year ago that asked for all

```
the relevant information and this is the first time I'm
 1
 2
       hearing about any conversations with the borrower or
 3
       borrower's attorney that she might be reaffirming a debt or
 4
        anything. That's discoverable information.
                  THE COURT: Did you -- wait. No. No. No. No.
 5
 6
       No. No.
                 No. No.
 7
                  MR. WAX: If they have -- we asked for -- reason to
 8
       believe that they know that there's a valid debt.
 9
                  THE COURT: That's an interesting take on the
10
        discovery obligations. You've asked for -- you said you asked
11
        for people with knowledge. Right?
12
                  Did you identify Ms. Sing?
13
                  MS. LIGHT: I don't believe so. She doesn't work
14
        for my client. She's not even a party to the action.
15
                  MR. WAX: But the attorney of Ms. Sing would be
16
       person of knowledge.
17
                  THE COURT: Well, Ms. Sing would first be a person
18
       with knowledge because she's the one who signed the loan
19
        documents and all that. Right?
20
                  MS. LIGHT: Right.
2.1
                  THE COURT: And you knew about that. Why didn't you
22
        identify them?
23
                  They're her discussions with the attorney. You're
24
       not entitled to -- I don't think you're entitled to know that.
25
                  But why didn't you -- why didn't you identify
```

2.1

```
Bernstein and Ms. Sing as people with knowledge, specifically because you knew that they were challenging the loan?
```

MS. LIGHT: Well, Your Honor, I guess I'd have to go back and look at the sequence of events. I only took over the file recently. And I believe discovery, in terms of written discovery, was completed a long time ago.

THE COURT: Yeah. But you have a -- you have an obligation to supplement discovery until the day the trial's over.

MS. LIGHT: Your Honor, you're obviously a hundred percent right. I have to go back and find out.

THE COURT: Not obviously.

MS. LIGHT: It's possible --

THE COURT: I'm not always right.

MS. LIGHT: It's possible though that other attorneys in his office were cc'd on the emails with Diane Bernstein. Because I only got her because the prior attorney was talking to her. So I have to double check.

Because, to be honest, I haven't really been dealing with Shane so much on this file. I mean, he's not the one that --

THE COURT: Okay. Here's what we're going to do.

Every attorney who's touched this is going to come. You're

going to bring everybody in to court because neither of you

has a handle on what's going on.

2.1

And someone's playing games. Or maybe everybody's playing games. And I'm really not -- my patience has run thin.

And I know you've got what three firms on the plaintiff's side? One, two --

MS. LIGHT: Well, now it's just my firm.

THE COURT: Well, there's -- they haven't been terminated these other firms. And, you know, you're in for a penny, you're in for a pound.

So you're going to get everybody from your office, from Margolin & Weinreb. You're going to get the -- whoever is the decision maker for Gustavia.

You're going to get everyone in your firm who's touched this case. Your clients. The managing person. The joker who got deposed who doesn't know anything.

You're going to get everybody together and we're going to have a discussion about it and we're going to find out who's the one who's playing games. All right?

You can't buy a debt -- buy a property for \$30,000 that has debt on it and expect to get away with it. All right? Bad business decision. Judgment day is coming.

You can't give loans and not dot your I's and cross your T's and do all the proper filings and all the proper notices.

So, you know, you folks, your clients can spend

money on you litigating this. You could put your licenses at risk if you're violating Rule 11, because a referral will be made to the disciplinary committee.

You can do whatever you want, but I'm giving you all the opportunity to stop this nonsense and we're going to deal with it. Okay?

MS. LIGHT: Okay.

2.1

 $\mbox{MR. WAX:}\mbox{ May I ask one question, Your Honor?}$

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WAX: You mentioned earlier about fixing the potential Rule 11 violations. Is that leave to amend the pleadings to --

THE COURT: No. That's not leave to amend the pleadings. If you want to amend your pleading to cure a Rule 11 violation, write me a letter. All right.

We're sticking with what you've done so far. You have to cure it. Okay? And you have to cure it the right way.

If you want to -- I don't have the case management plan in front of me, but amendment of pleadings I think is probably -- the date has probably come and gone for that.

MS. LIGHT: Right.

THE COURT: So if you want -- if you want to amend, you write me a letter and say, look, we realize this isn't a proper affirmative defense. We'd like to withdraw it and file

an amended pleading, an amended answer.

If you think there's something wrong with the complaint, you've got to do the same thing. All right.

You all could save yourselves a hell of a lot of problems and get out from under crazy Judge Reyes if you resolve this case. All right? Throw good money after bad —both sides — is what you're doing. Okay.

I suggest you get a transcript of this conference, show it to your clients, because then they'll know we're all going to sit down and work this out. And it may not be worked out to everyone's satisfaction, but it will get worked out.

All right.

So I'm sticking with the current schedule of the depositions, and the letters, and all of the that. I'm going to give you the opportunity to avoid that.

If by the 14th of September, which is the date that the plaintiff needs to submit a letter motion to compel the deposition — if by that date you all can agree to either resolve this case, or have a settlement conference where everyone, attorneys, clients, everyone can come and we can talk about all these issues, all this nonsense that's going on.

If you can agree to that, then you can tell me that on the 14th. We'll hold off on the deposition. We'll hold off on the Rule 11. We'll hold off on amending the pleadings.

And we'll come up with a date for that settlement conference.

If you can't -- if you can't agree to that -because I'm not going to force people to come sit with me and
get taken out to the wood shed. If they don't want to do
that, that's fine. Then we have the dates for the motion to
compel, the response. You file your request to amend,
whatever. And we'll continue on.

I'll find out from Judge Glasser if he wants to deal with the motion to appoint a receiver or if he wants me to deal with it.

MR. WAX: Your Honor, on that note, it's plaintiff's motion to appoint a receiver, and defendant has asked to move for summary judgment.

THE COURT: Well, I'll find out if he wants me to deal with that summary judgment -- that pre-motion letter for summary judgment as well.

What is the basis for summary judgment?

MR. WAX: Several bases, first of which is standing. Based through discovery, we've discovered that plaintiff does not have properly endorsed notes.

They're basing -- apparently basing their standing on allonges, which were not properly annexed and apparently not in their possession. They don't have a written assignment of the mortgage and the note, just the mortgage.

We also argue based on the discovery given, we've

2.1

```
received, there's no evidence of a default. But now I'm hearing for the first time they may possess documents or other information that may show there's a default.
```

But then there's also -- it's not in my letter,

because we were limited to five pages -- statute of

limitations. This case was commenced about I think ten years,

11 years after the note was supposedly defaulted on. The

statute of limitations is 6 years.

There's at least several years of payments, if any, due that are barred. So there's a couple of grounds for the motion.

THE COURT: All right. How much was the original loan?

MS. LIGHT: It was about \$200,000.

THE COURT: And what's left on it?

MS. LIGHT: It's almost the full amount. I think only one payment was made.

THE COURT: When was -- when did she default on it?

MS. LIGHT: 2008.

THE COURT: You have six years, right, from --

MS. LIGHT: Six years.

So what would happen is is when we -- let's say we'd be permitted to proceed, we would waive all payments that were due more than six years ago. We're not going to seek to collect anything of course that's part of a statute of

```
limitations.
```

2.1

And that's what he was saying. He was saying that there were payments that we can't collect. So if there are payments that are barred by the statute of limitations, we will not be seeking to collect them.

THE COURT: What about -- to foreclose, you need possession of the note, correct?

MR. LOGAN: Yes, Your Honor. They haven't inspected the original note, so I don't really know what their basis is.

THE COURT: Do you have it? Do you have the original note?

MS. LIGHT: Yes, absolutely. Yes, we do. And so they --

MR. WAX: I believe we asked to inspect it $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$

MS. LIGHT: Right.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ WAX: -- and it was supposed to be at the deposition and it wasn't.

MS. LIGHT: Right. And we told -- we told David

Berg before the deposition I can either bring it to you in

Brooklyn or you can come to my office in Manhattan and I would

produce it for them.

MR. WAX: We can work on that.

MS. LIGHT: I'd be happy to produce it to them. But their basis is not based on actual inspection of a note. It's based on the copies filed --

20 THE COURT: All right. All the more --1 2 MR. WAX: Our basis is based on their client's 3 testimony. THE COURT: This is all the more reason why you 4 should bring -- you should bring your principals, your 5 clients, to meet with me. 6 7 Because this is -- I was going to use an expletive, 8 but I won't -- this crap may fly down the street in King 9 Supreme. Not here. All right. 10 Shame on you, your client. They're here all the 11 They've probably had, you know, a couple of hundred 12 cases in this courthouse in the 12 years that I've been here. 13 They know better. 14 And shame on you for, your client, for these 15 ridiculous affirmative defenses that they have no knowledge 16 of. 17 So we've got our schedule. Let me know by the 14th 18 if you are willing to bring your clients, or you've settled, 19 or you want to go forward with this motion to compel the depositions -- deposition. And we'll deal with it that way. 20 2.1 Again, I'll find out from Judge Glasser what he 22 wants to do with the summary judgment motion and the motion to 23 appoint a receiver. All right. 24 MS. LIGHT: Thank you.

MR. WAX: Thank you, Your Honor.

25

| | 21 |
|----|--|
| 1 | THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. |
| 2 | (Proceedings concluded at 11:08 a.m.) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, CHRISTINE FIORE, court-approved transcriber and certified |
| 5 | electronic reporter and transcriber, certify that the |
| 6 | foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic |
| 7 | sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled |
| 8 | matter. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Christine Lione |
| 11 | September 13, 2018 |
| 12 | Christine Fiore, CERT |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |